

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 10-14, 18 and 23-25 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-9, 15, 17, 19-22, 26 and 27 have been amended. No claims are added. Claims 16 and 28-32 remain unchanged.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 14-19 and 23-25

Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 14-19 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,245 to Johnson, II et al. (hereinafter "Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,437 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Generally, the presently claimed subject matter is concerned with updating network client computers to correspond to configuration changes in a network server computer. When a configuration change is made in the server, the server identifies corresponding changes that should be made to the clients to optimally function with the updated server configuration. The server notifies each network client that a server configuration change has occurred. The server either automatically updates each client computer with the necessary changes or causes a description of the necessary changes to be displayed at the client. In the latter case, a client user can accept or decline the client updates.

Johnson discloses a system and method for evaluating the operation of a computer over a computer network. In short, Johnson describes a remote

Type of Response: RCE Amendment

Application Number: 09/669,819

Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01

Filing Date: 09/26/2000

diagnostic procedure and system. A user at a first network computer (hereinafter "server") selects a diagnostic program to run at a second network computer (hereinafter "client"). The diagnostic program requests the client to provide client configuration data to the server, where the data can be examined by a network administrator to resolve an operational issue at the client.

Chen discloses a process and system for real-time monitoring of a data processing system for its administration and maintenance support in the operating phase. Chen describes a first sever collecting configuration and status data from multiple other servers and collecting that data in a dynamic web page. Network client computers can access the dynamic web page and examine the server data.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites a "method for updating a client computer coupled by means of a network to a server computer." The method includes the steps of (1) "identifying a change of status of the server computer," (2) "identifying at least one client configuration change that may be required by the change of status of the server computer" and (3) "transmitting a status message to the client computer, the status message including the identified at least one client configuration change."

The first element of claim 1 requires that a first computer identify a change in the status of the first computer. This element is not taught or suggested by Johnson because Johnson deals with a first computer that examines a status of a second computer. Similarly, Chen only describes a client computer discovering the status of one or more server computers.

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

Claim 1 also requires that the server identify changes that need to be made to a *client* configuration based on changes identified in the server configuration. Neither Johnson nor Chen teach or suggest this element. While the diagnostics program disclosed in Johnson may identify changes that need to be made on a remote computer, Johnson does not teach or suggest that such changes have any relation to a configuration of the computer running the diagnostics program. Chen does not teach or suggest identifying changes that need to be made at a client computer at all, much less based on changes that occur in a server computer.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11 and 14 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite an "apparatus for updating one or more client computers coupled to a computer network having a server computer that includes at least one processor for executing a stored program within a server computer memory...." The stored program comprises "a status update component," "a communications component" and "a read-only status component."

The status update component allows "a user to change a status of the server computer and to identify one or more client configuration changes that

Type of Response: RCE Amendment

Application Number: 09/669,819

Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01

Filing Date: 09/26/2000

should be made to at least one client computer in response to the change of status of the server. The communications component is configured to transmit "a status message by means of the network to the one or more client computers regarding the change of status of the server computer to apprise client users that a status of the server computer has changed. The read-only status component is configured to expose "a detailed listing of the updated status of said server and the client configuration changes."

At least one element that is not taught or disclosed in either of the cited references is a component (such as the status update component) that is configured to identify one or more client configuration changes that should be made to at least one client computer in response to the change of status of the server.

Such a component or process requires identifying a relationship between changes made on a first computer with corresponding changes that should be made on a second computer. This is not taught or disclosed by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Johnson describes examining the status of a remote computer and determining if any changes need to be made to the remote computer. This determination does not have any relationship to changes made at another computer, as required by claim 15. Chen merely discloses examining a dynamic web page to see a current status of one or more other computers. Chen does not discuss identifying changes that need to be made on a remote computer, much less identifying such changes in response to changes on another computer.

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 has been amended and now recites one or more computer-readable media that contain executable instructions that implement a method when executed. The method includes the steps of (1) identifying a change in a status of a server computer," (2) "identifying a client configuration change required in one or more client computers connected to the server computer via a network, said client configuration change being necessitated by the change in status of the server computer" and (3) "transmitting a status message to the one or more client computers regarding the client configuration change."

Johnson does not teach or suggest any of the steps in the method because Johnson relates to diagnostic procedures. In particular, Johnson does not discuss identifying a change in a server configuration or changes in a client that may be required as a result of the change in the server configuration. Chen does not teach or suggest identifying a change in a status of a server because Chen discloses a client merely looking at snapshots of server status. Neither does Chen teach or suggest either of the other steps in the method.

Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 has been canceled thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 19 depends from claim 17 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 should also be withdrawn.

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

Claims 23-25 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claims 6, 12, 13 and 20

Claims 6, 12, 13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Chen as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 14-0 and 23-25 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,565 to Kenner et al. (hereinafter "Kenner"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kenner discloses a system and method for automated identification, retrieval, and installation of multimedia software components. A client computer includes a script file that maintains information on current version numbers for installed software components. The current version numbers are compared against stored configuration information to determine if updates are required. If so, the updates are acquired from a server and are installed at the client.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and, therefore, contains each element recited in claim 1 (discussed in detail above, in the response to the rejection of claim 1). Kenner, alone or in combination with Johnson and Chen, does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable over the cited references by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Hence, the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

Claim 20 depends from claim 17. The addition of Kenner to Johnson and Chen does not add any element to the combination that would render claim 17 unallowable. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable over the cited references by virtue of its dependency on claim 17. Therefore, the rejection of claim 20 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, 21 and 22

Claims 8, 9, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Chen as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 14-0 and 23-25 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,955 to DeKoning et al. (hereinafter "DeKoning"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

DeKoning discloses a system and method for managing device configuration changes. The system and method include a management station which issues a configuration change request to a managed device and waits for a reply from the managed device. The managed device receives the configuration change request from the management station and processes the change request until the configuration request is durable on the managed device. The managed device then returns a status to the management station indicating that the configuration request is durable. The management station receives the status from the managed device and stops waiting for a reply. In the meantime, the managed device continues processing the configuration change request.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, include each element recited in claim 1. Claim 1 has been shown, above, to be allowable over

Type of Response: RCE Amendment

Application Number: 09/669,819

Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01

Filing Date: 09/26/2000

Johnson and Chen. The addition of DeKoning to the combination of Johnson and Chen does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1. As such, the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 8 and 9. Accordingly, claims 8 and 9 are allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 17 and, therefore, contain each element recited in claim 17 (discussed in detail above, in the response to the rejection of claim 17). DeKoning, alone or in combination with Johnson and Chen, does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 17.

Accordingly, claims 21 and 22 is allowable over the cited references by virtue of its dependency on claim 17. Hence, the rejection of claims 21 and 22 should be withdrawn.

Claims 26-32

Claims 26-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Chen as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 14-0 and 23-25 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,709 to Reha et al. (hereinafter "Reha"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 26 has been amended and recites a "method for updating a configuration of a client computer in response to a reconfiguration of a network server." The method includes the steps of "receiving a notification from the server that at least one of multiple server configuration settings has been updated," "determining an updated status of the multiple server configuration settings" and "displaying a list of client reconfiguration choices corresponding to the updated server status."

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

The method also includes the additional steps of "receiving user input to accept or modify the list of client reconfiguration choices" and "displaying a command button which, when actuated, causes a reconfiguring of the client computer based upon the list of client reconfiguration choices."

By the same rationale discussed at length above, the combination of Johnson, Chen and Raha does not teach or suggest one or more of the steps recited in claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-32 depend from claim 26 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, claims 27-32 are allowable over the cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: RCE Amendment
Application Number: 09/669,819
Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01
Filing Date: 09/26/2000

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 2-21-05

By: James Banowsky

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) _____

02-21-2005
Date

J. Okes
Signature

Rimma N. Okes
Type or Print Name

Type of Response: RCE Amendment

Application Number: 09/669,819

Attorney Docket Number: 144211.01

Filing Date: 09/26/2000